A 2615-1 U 6/92

Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1981

By Judith Getzels and Gregory Longhini

American Planning Association

PAS Planning Advisory Service
Report Number 366

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Cover design by Richard Sessions.

Planning Advisory Service is a subscription research service of the American Planning Association. Eight to 10 reports are produced each year. Subscribers also receive the *PAS Memo* each month and use of the Inquiry Answering Service. Israel Stollman, Executive Director; Frank S. So, Deputy Executive Director; David R. Mosena, Director of Research.

Planning Advisory Service Reports are produced at APA. Sylvia Lewis, Publications Director; Adele Rothblatt, Assistant Editor.

© Copyright 1982 by the American Planning Association, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637. APA has headquarters offices at 1776 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036. Published January 1982.

Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1981

By Judith Getzels and Gregory Longhini

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1. Overview 1
Trends 1

Section 2. Salaries 5
Type of Employer and Years of Experience 5
Qualifications 8
Size of Jurisdiction 9
Directors and Staff 9
Regional Effects 10
Minority Representation and Salaries 13
Suburban Salaries Highest 14
The Effect of Population Growth Rate on Salaries 15

Section 3. Women Planners: Salaries and Employment Patterns 17
Women Directors and Years of Experience 17
Educational Levels 18
Type of Employment 18
Size of Jurisdiction 18
Regional Distribution 19
In Conclusion 21

Appendix A. Growth Factor Among States 22

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Where Planners Work: Public Agencies 1
Table 2. Where Planners Work: Nonpublic Employment 2
Table 3: Where Public Agency Planners Work: By Jurisdiction Size 2
Table 4. Where Planners Work: Regional Shifts 3
Table 5. Where Planners Work: By Growth Areas 4
Table 6. Median Number of Years of Experience 4
Table 7. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Employer 6
Table 8. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Employer 7
Table 9. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and Employer 7
Table 10. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and Years of Experience 8
Table 11. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Jurisdiction Size 8
Table 12. Directors' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Employer 9

Table 13: Staff Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Employer 10
Table 14. Planners' Median Salaries—Directors and Staff: By Sex, Region, and Experience 11
Table 15. Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex and Region 12
Table 16. Distribution of Planners: By Race/Ethnicity, and Sex 12
Table 17. Planners' Median Salaries: By Race/Ethnicity, Qualification, Experience, and Employer 13
Table 18. Comparison of Jurisdictions: By Size and Type 14
Table 19. Public Agency Planners' Median Salaries: By Jurisdiction Type 14
Table 20: Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex, Qualification, Experience, and Growth Area 15
Table 21: Planners' Median Salaries: By Sex 17
Table 22: Distribution of Directors: By Sex 17
Table 23: Years of Planners' Experience: By Sex 18
Table 24: Distribution of Planners: By Sex and Educational Qualifications 18
Table 25: Distribution of Planning Employment: By Sex 19
Table 26: Distribution of Planners' Employment: By Sex and Jurisdiction Size 19
Table 27: Distribution of Planners: By Sex and Region 20
Table 28: Distribution of Planners: By Sex and State 20

Section 1. Overview

This report continues the series produced by APA on the salaries and employment characteristics of its membership. The surveys used to gather the data for this report were mailed in September 1981. Forty-five percent of the 17,665 nonstudent, professional planners surveyed responded in time to be included in the analysis of the data on which this report is based.

The first section of the report will compare data collected in 1977 and 1981, highlighting changes in selected employment characteristics that can be expected to have implications for planning practice and planning education. The second section focuses on salaries as they are affected by the important variables—years of experience, geographic region of employment, size of jurisdiction, type of employer, and sex. Characteristics of agency directors, heads of departments and firms, and minority group planners are also examined. In response to requests from our membership, a third section of the report this year compares and analyzes in detail salaries and employment characteristics of men and women planners.

TRENDS

Comparison of data from the APA survey taken five years ago with data from the current survey indicates that the planning profession closely reflects changes in the demographic, economic, and political climate of the country as a whole.

More Planners Work in the Private Sector

The majority of APA planners responding to this year's survey work for public agencies, as they have in the past, but the proportion is declining. In 1977, 72.7 percent of the respondents reported that they worked for public agencies; in 1981, the proportion had decreased to 63.7 percent. The proportional losses in each category of public agency employment were moderate, with one exception: planners working for metropolitan or regional agencies slipped from 15.1 percent of the total five years ago to 8.5 percent today—a 44 percent rate of loss. (See Table 1.)

Slightly over a third of the planners responding to the

TABLE 1. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: PUBLIC AGENCIES

	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS	
TYPE OF PUBLIC AGENCY EMPLOYMENT	1977	1981
CITY/PLANNING	26.4	26.3
COUNTY/PLANNING	11.9	11.4
JOINT CITY/COUNTY	3.6	2.6
METRO OR REGIONAL	15.1	8.5
STATE OR PROVINCIAL	11.7	10.9
FEDERAL	4.0	4.0
TOTAL PUBLIC AGENCY EMPLOYMENT	72.7%	63.7%

TABLE 2. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: NONPUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

TYPE OF NONPUBLIC EMPLOYMENT	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS 1977	1981
CONSULTANTS	15.5	18.6
PRIVATE BUSINESS	1.8	4.6
COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	5.6	6.1
NONPROFIT	2.9	3.1
OTHER	-	2.3
TOTAL NONPUBLIC EMPLOYMENT	26%	34.5%

survey worked outside of public agencies—as consultants, in business, in public and private colleges or universities, and in nonprofit and other private institutions—a 32.6 percent rate of gain since 1977. Planners working as consultants or in private business account for most of the gain; the proportion of planners working in business has more than doubled, although these planners still account for a very small percentage of all respondents. (See Table 2.)

Fewer Planners Work in Big Cities

The proportion of respondents working in cities and counties of less than 50,000 population was 50 percent larger in 1981 than it was in 1977. This represents a striking change in the five-year period. In 1977, almost half the respondents surveyed worked in jurisdictions with populations of over 250,000. By 1981, the distribution of planners in jurisdictions of various sizes was considerably more even. Most impressive in this period is the proportional increase in employment in jurisdictions with populations of under 50,000. (See Table 3.)

These changes are not surprising when we consider the well-documented shift in population from large urban to smaller urban and nonurban areas in the last decade. The data suggest that the planning profession reflects this shift. If there ever was resistance to planners in small cities and towns, it appears to be giving way.

Planning Jobs Increase in the Growing Western Regions

In the last five years, shifts in the regional distribution of planners reflect shifts in population growth in the United States as a whole. As in previous surveys, we follow the geographical categories for the United States used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. All Canadian agencies are grouped together. (See Table 4.)

As Table 4 indicates, from 1977 to 1981 the proportion of planners responding to the survey showed a solid gain in three regions of the country. The Mountain region showed the largest rate of gain, followed by the Pacific and the West South Central regions. These increases reflect the relatively high population growth rates over the last decade for the states making up each region.

The 1980 U.S. Census shows that the country's population as a whole grew at a rate of 11.4 percent in the last 10 years. During this period, the population in each state in the three regions with a larger share of planners grew at a rate higher than the national rate—from Nevada, which grew at a rate of 63 percent, to Montana, at a rate of 13 percent. Montana, in fact, was the only state in the Mountain region to grow at a rate of less than 20 percent. (See Appendix A for a full list of states and growth rates.)

In addition to increasing their share of planners, both the Mountain region and the Pacific region employ a high ratio of planners to their populations as a whole. This

TABLE 3. WHERE PUBLIC AGENCY PLANNERS WORK: BY JURISDICTION SIZE

POPULATION	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS 1977	1981
OVER 250,000	45.6	34
50 TO 249,999	34.0	35.5
UNDER 50,000	20.3	30.5

TABLE 4. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: REGIONAL SHIFTS

REGIONS	PERCENT OF PLANNERS RESPONDING 1977	1981	RATE OF CHANGE	REGION'S PERCENT OF U.S. POPULATION
1. NEW ENGLAND CONNECTICUT MAINE MASSACHUSETTS NEW HAMPSHIRE RHODE ISLAND VERMONT	6.4%	6.1%	-4.6%	5.5%
2. MIDDLE ATLANTIC NEW JERSEY NEW YORK PENNSYLVANIA	12.7	12.4	- 2.3	16
3. SOUTH ATLANTIC DELAWARE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FLORIDA MARYLAND NORTH CAROLINA SOUTH CAROLINA VIRGINIA WEST VIRGINIA	20.4	19.8	- 2.9	16
4. EAST SOUTH CENTRAL ALABAMA KENTUCKY MISSISSIPPI TENNESSEE	4.1	3.9	- 4.8	6.4
5. EAST NORTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS INDIANA MICHIGAN OHIO WISCONSIN	15.1	14.1	- 6.6	18.4
6. WEST NORTH CENTRAL IOWA KANSAS MINNESOTA MISSOURI NEBRASKI NORTH DAKOTA SOUTH DAKOTA	7.3	6.8	- 6.8	7.6
7. WEST SOUTH CENTRAL ARKANSAS LOUISIANA OKLAHOMA TEXAS	5.9	6.4	+ 8.4	10.5
8. MOUNTAIN ARIZONA COLORADO IDAHO MONTANA NEVADA NEW MEXICO UTAH WYOMING	6	7.7	+28.3	5
9. PACIFIC ALASKA CALIFORNIA HAWAII OREGON WASHINGTON	18	20	+11	14
10. CANADA	3	2.9	- 3	-

TABLE 5. WHERE PLANNERS WORK: BY GROWTH AREAS

POPULATION GROWTH AREAS (1970-1980)	SHARE OF U.S. POPULATION (1980)	SHARE OF U.S. PLANNERS (1981)
HIGH-GROWTH (15 STATES WITH 20% OF GROWTH OR MORE)	20.6%	23.5%
GROWING/STABLE (15 STATES WITH 11.4 - 19.9% GROWTH)	30.4	30.1
STABLE/DECLINING (20 STATES WITH LESS THAN 11.4% GROWTH)	49	46.4

is not the case, however, in the West South Central region. This region, with 10.5 percent of the U.S. population, employs only 6.4 percent of all planners responding. The West South Central region's ratio of planners to population is the lowest of all regions, a position it shares with the East South Central region.

The percentages of planners responding to the survey in the remaining regions of the U.S. all declined since 1977. Although the South Atlantic and New England regions employed a relatively high ratio of planners to population in 1981, both report a slightly smaller percentage of planners responding than in 1977.

Responses from the Middle Atlantic region and three of the central regions—East South Central and East and West North Central—all with relatively low ratios of planners to population in 1981, showed a decline in the percentage of planners responding to the survey.

As Appendix A indicates, between 1970 and 1980, 15 states grew at a rate of over 20 percent. These are labled "High Growth" in Table 5. Fifteen other states grew faster than the national rate of 11.4 percent, but at a rate of less than 20 percent. These are labled "Growing/Stable" in Table 5. The remaining 20 states either grew at a rate less than the nation as a whole (11.4 percent) or actually lost population. These are labled "Stable/Declining."

Table 5 shows that high growth states have a proportionately greater share of the national pool of planners, while stable/declining states have a proportionately smaller share. The variations are not dramatic, but they are consistent. The belief that planning is a "growth-oriented" field appears to be borne out by the data.

An analysis of salaries by growth areas appears in the following section on page 15.

The Planning Profession Is Graying

Planners as a group are aging, or at least they are more experienced. Planners working at entry level jobs with four years or less of experience represent a smaller percentage of the membership in 1981 than in 1977. (See Table 6.)

The median number of years of experience in 1977 was 6.2; in 1981, 7.9. There are a number of factors contributing to this change. The most obvious explanation of the shift is that the average age of planners, like the average age of the population in general, is steadily increasing. In addition to demographic factors, we may hypothesize that the current economic pinch plays a part in raising the median years of experience. To the degree that there were fewer new planners hired and more layoffs for planners in 1981, those planners still employed will have more seniority since, most commonly, the last hired are first fired. New policies that stipulate raising the mandatory retirement age in many public agencies also result in fewer positions available for entry level planners. How this 1981 population of planners fares in terms of salaries will be examined in the following sections.

TABLE 6. MEDIAN NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS	
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	1977	1981
4 YEARS AND UNDER	33.2	26.9
5-10 YEARS	34.9	38.3
11 YEARS AND OVER	31.9	34.8

Section 2. Salaries

The median salary of all planners responding to the survey in 1981 was $25,990, up 8.29 percent from $24,000 in 1980. Thus, overall, planners' salaries are not quite keeping pace with the 1981 inflation rate of 8.9 percent.[1] Tables 7 and 8 illustrate what effect type of employer, experience, educational qualifications, and sex have on median salaries. For simplicity, Table 8 and subsequent tables combine employment types.

TYPE OF EMPLOYER AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

In 1981, planners working for the federal government, for business, and as private consultants earned the highest salaries at all levels of experience, as they had in past years. (See Table 7.) Moreover, the salary lead of these three groups increases steadily with experience and is greatest for planners with 10 or more years of experience. State planners with less than five years of experience are also at the high end of the scale, but they lose their edge as they gain more experience.

The salary differential for planners with five years of experience or less is relatively small among the employment groups. With the exception of those who work for private business, the greatest median salary differential for those with less than five years of experience was about $2,700—the difference between $17,200 for metropolitan/regional planners and approximately $19,900 for private consultants.

As planners gain more experience, the gap between the highest and lowest median salaries widens. Again, excepting planners who work for private business, the greatest median salary differential grows to $6,900 for planners with five to 10 years of experience—$21,950 for joint city/county planners versus $28,850 for planners working for the federal government.

For planners with more than 10 years of experience, the differential grows to about $10,000. County planners and joint city/county planners with more than 10 years of experience earn a median salary of somewhat less than $30,000 a year. Planners working for the federal government, in private business, and as private consultants, all earn median salaries in the range of $40,000.

Table 9 indicates overall median salaries for men and women by employment type. One lesson that emerges from comparing Table 7 and Table 9 is that overall median salary figures may tell an individual planner less about what he or she can expect to earn than median salary figures that take other variables into account, especially years of experience and, in some cases, sex as well. For example, note that Table 7 indicates that federal government planners earn more than university/college faculty at every level of experience. Table 9, however, indicates a slightly higher overall median salary for university/college faculty than for federal government planners. How can we explain this discrepancy? We may hypothesize that universities and colleges in particular are cutting down staff and hiring fewer new planners. The planners that remain on faculties are likely, therefore, to be somewhat more experienced and, therefore, better paid. In addition, Table 25, in the following section, indicates that universities and colleges employ a higher proportion of males than other employment categories—again, accounting for a higher overall median salary figure. What we may conclude is that college and university faculties are not earning significantly more than other types of planners, but that fewer beginning planners are entering the teaching profession.

1. The 8.9 percent rate of inflation is the lowest of five rates computed by alternative methods in common use. The highest of the five is 12.4 percent. See, "Defining the Rate of Underlying Inflation," by David W. Callahan, in *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 104, No. 9, Sept. 1981, pp. 16-19.

TABLE 7. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

		MALE (N = 6409)				FEMALE (N = 1385)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
CITY	19,100	18,350	19,480	21,400*	19,110	18,330	19,620	24,000*	19,100
COUNTY	17,430	16,100	18,600	---	17,530	16,050	18,030	---	17,030
JOINT CITY-COUNTY	18,280	16,430	19,930	---	18,680	15,500*	17,350*	---	17,000
METRO/REGIONAL	17,200	15,000	17,350	---	17,300	14,150	17,400	---	17,000
STATE PLANNING	19,700	20,000*	19,850	26,500*	20,000	13,750*	17,400*	---	17,300
OTHER STATE	19,040	17,730	19,970	28,100*	19,400	15,550	20,030	17,600*	19,000
FEDERAL	19,500	16,980	22,500	32,400*	22,480	14,000	20,000	20,000*	18,640
PRIVATE CONSULTANT	19,960	19,800	20,480	9,550*	20,030	17,980	18,650	20,000*	18,350
BUSINESS	23,990	24,050	24,030	30,000*	24,030	24,650*	22,050	---	23,050
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	19,150	4,850*	17,250	24,000	21,050	4,050*	16,050	24,000*	16,000
FOUNDATION	18,040	14,980	18,500*	21,050*	17,530	17,000*	19,000	---	18,550
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
CITY	24,980	24,800	25,650	31,000*	25,040	21,950	22,960	25,650*	22,450
COUNTY	23,020	21,050	24,030	---	22,990	18,100	25,550	20,000*	23,750
JOINT CITY-COUNTY	21,950	22,000	23,000	---	22,600	21,550*	21,050*	---	21,050
METRO/REGIONAL	23,550	21,980	24,400	25,800*	23,800	18,000	25,050	---	22,400
STATE	24,020	19,050	25,030	24,050*	24,030	24,930*	22,000*	---	24,000
OTHER STATE	25,000	22,000	25,150	30,050*	25,020	22,050*	24,500	40,000*	24,500
FEDERAL	28,850	27,050*	28,750	30,050*	28,980	28,850*	27,030	---	28,800
PRIVATE CONSULTANT	27,580	25,990	29,960	28,700*	28,250	20,050	25,450	---	25,000
BUSINESS	32,430	29,550	32,990	40,000*	33,030	15,750*	30,000	---	28,000
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	25,010	15,000*	22,950	27,970	25,500	---	21,650*	24,000*	22,000
FOUNDATION	25,030	20,050*	27,500	33,000*	27,480	15,050*	22,650	27,000*	23,500
OVER 10 YEARS									
CITY	32,100	31,960	33,020	33,400*	32,290	25,600	31,950	---	29,980
COUNTY	29,500	28,800	30,030	42,200*	29,800	28,600*	28,050	---	28,050
JOINT CITY/COUNTY	28,950	30,300	29,230	---	29,230	24,000*	28,500*	---	27,530*
METRO/REGIONAL	31,960	30,010	32,870	39,980	31,990	33,850*	30,030	---	29,980
STATE	33,500	26,650	33,980	29,500*	33,400	27,000*	39,100*	---	36,050*
OTHER STATE	32,950	32,650	34,040	34,000*	33,550	22,200*	29,000	---	25,550
FEDERAL	40,980	41,700	43,480	42,050*	43,000	19,050*	31,050	---	31,000
PRIVATE CONSULTANT	39,400	38,050	39,970	40,040	39,970	34,050	24,200	45,000*	30,000
BUSINESS	40,980	44,100	40,980	54,850*	42,020	21,650*	35,000	---	31,980
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	35,960	41,000*	35,030	38,020	36,010	27,500*	28,000	23,050	27,000
FOUNDATION	32,980	28,750	35,000	75,000*	33,030	25,050*	22,050*	---	25,050*

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES; SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

TABLE 8. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

		MALE (N = 6411)				FEMALE (N = 1415)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	18,720	17,550	19,150	21,400*	18,740	17,550	19,300	24,000*	18,580
STATE/FEDERAL	18,400	16,980	19,050	28,100*	18,670	15,000	18,580	17,650*	18,000
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	20,030	20,000	21,050	29,980*	20,990	18,050	19,250	20,000*	20,050
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	18,330	14,030	17,700	24,000	19,030	13,500	18,550	24,000*	18,300
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	24,030	23,100	25,040	31,000*	24,400	21,230	23,600	25,600*	22,750
STATE/FEDERAL	25,000	22,020	25,500	30,000	25,020	22,000	25,010	40,000*	24,900
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	28,730	25,050	29,990	30,050	29,950	20,050	26,550	30,000*	25,040
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	25,030	20,000	24,550	27,980	26,050	15,050*	22,150	24,050*	22,650
OVER 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	31,110	30,280	32,020	38,950*	31,500	25,600	30,200	---	29,050
STATE/FEDERAL	33,970	32,020	34,750	39,980	34,020	22,850	30,980	---	29,800
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	39,960	39,950	39,980	44,000	39,980	30,050	28,850	45,000*	30,030
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	35,040	35,030	35,030	38,030	35,970	27,000*	27,700	23,050	26,980

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES: SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

TABLE 9. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND EMPLOYER

EMPLOYER	TOTAL	MALE (N=6589)	FEMALE (N=1432)
CITY	25,010	26,040	20,960
COUNTY	23,530	24,030	19,990
JOINT CITY/COUNTY	23,550	24,040	20,850
METRO/REGIONAL	24,730	25,650	18,300
STATE PLANNING AGENCIES	26,650	27,030	22,800
OTHER STATE AGENCIES	24,990	26,200	22,030
FEDERAL	30,050	32,970	24,970
PRIVATE CONSULTANTS	30,010	31,950	21,020
BUSINESS	32,990	35,500	25,010
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	30,100	32,550	21,500
NONPROFIT FOUNDATIONS	24,030	27,520	21,050

TABLE 10. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	MEDIAN SALARIES		
	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
5 YEARS AND UNDER	18,690	19,040	18,480
6 TO 10 YEARS	25,010	25,140	23,990
11 YEARS AND OVER	33,980	34,610	29,000

The overall effect of the number of years of experience on men's and women's salaries is shown in Table 10. Although the discrepancy is slight for planners with five years of experience or less, it increases to more than $5,500 for experienced planners.

QUALIFICATIONS

Tables 7 and 8 indicate the relative effect of academic degrees on salary levels. For planners with less than 10 years of experience, a graduate education corresponds to a higher salary level, with one interesting exception. Business employers do not appear to be impressed with advanced degrees for entry level jobs. (Other exceptions are found only in those categories with too few responses to be statistically representative.) When the employment group is held constant, a master's degree will usually increase the median salary by a few thousand dollars per year, and the infrequent Ph.D. will add a few thousand dollars more. However, after 10 years of experience, the differential salary associated with an academic degree is

TABLE 11. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND JURISDICTION SIZE

	MALE (N = 3659)					FEMALE (N = 807)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
250,000 AND OVER	18,960	16,550	19,600	21,400*	19,060	16,500	19,000	20,000*	18,700
50,000 TO 249,999	18,050	17,000	18,830	7,400*	18,300	17,000	19,030	24,000*	18,010
UNDER 50,000	18,400	17,400	19,270	24,050*	18,410	16,700	19,020	---	18,450
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
250,000 AND OVER	25,040	23,470	25,620	31,000	25,150	26,850	24,960	25,650*	25,010
50,000 TO 249,999	24,020	23,300	24,980	30,000*	24,510	21,000	23,700	20,050*	22,180
UNDER 50,000	24,010	22,550	25,350	34,300*	24,530	19,550	21,850	---	21,200
OVER 10 YEARS									
250,000 AND OVER	34,330	32,800	35,000	34,000	34,680	27,050	32,050	41,000*	32,000
50,000 TO 249,999	30,800	31,750	31,500	29,750*	31,030	25,600	29,700	---	27,550
UNDER 50,000	28,950	28,000	30,000	42,000*	29,230	21,800	25,650	---	23,650

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES: SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

TABLE 12. DIRECTORS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

	MALE (N = 2409)				FEMALE (N = 210)				
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	19,610	18,950	20,000	24,700*	19,770	18,900	18,650	---	18,950
STATE/FEDERAL	19,530	17,700	21,050	---	20,000	17,050*	18,200*	---	18,200*
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	20,020	19,200	26,050	29,980*	20,030	---	23,050*	---	23,050*
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	22,450	12,050*	24,000*	23,050*	23,000	17,000*	22,000*	43,000*	22,000
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	25,040	24,030	26,040	33,000*	25,230	19,200	23,050	---	21,250
STATE/FEDERAL	26,250	26,200	25,830	44,000*	26,230	20,000*	27,050	43,000*	27,000
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	30,040	29,990	34,050	20,050*	31,030	20,050*	29,000*	30,000*	25,350
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	27,500	12,050*	27,500	32,050	31,980	15,000*	26,700*	---	20,050
OVER 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	32,040	31,040	33,480	49,250*	32,080	25,950	32,000	---	30,250
STATE/FEDERAL	35,010	33,030	35,350	42,050*	35,030	25,000*	34,050*	---	28,000*
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	40,010	40,010	40,030	44,980	40,030	22,050*	20,030	45,000*	22,050
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	39,980	38,700	37,050	42,550	40,000	27,500*	31,750*	37,050*	37,000*

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES; SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

less predictable. As Table 7 indicates, male planners with over 10 years of experience who work for private business or joint city/county agencies earn more with a bachelor's degree than they do with a master's degree. The Ph.D., however, is still accompanied by an increase. For women with over 10 years of experience, a master's degree can increase salary by up to $6,000 (for city planners), or it can decrease it by $10,000 (for consultants). Male/female salary differentials indicated in Tables 7 and 8 will be discussed in the special section of the report beginning on page 17.

SIZE OF JURISDICTION

Table 11 compares public agency salary levels in large, medium, and small jurisdictions. Years of experience have an effect on median salaries in jurisdictions of varying sizes similar to the effect indicated in Tables 7 and 8 for types of employers; that is, for planners with under 10 years of experience, the differences in median salaries between jurisdictions of various sizes is slight. However, for planners with more than 10 years of experience, those who work for agencies in the largest jurisdictions earn a median salary of about $5,400 more than those who work in cities of under 50,000.

DIRECTORS AND STAFF

Tables 12 and 13, respectively, analyze the data for men and women who are directors of agencies, heads of academic departments, or chief officers in their firms (referred to collectively as "directors"), and for all others (referred to collectively as "staff"). Thirty-five percent of the total sample report that they are directors.

A comparison between the two tables indicates that the directors of public agencies with fewer than 10 years of experience will earn about $1,300 more than staff members at comparable levels of experience. With more than 10 years of experience, the difference in salaries between directors and nondirectors of public agencies increases to about $2,100. The relatively small size of the differential may be attributed to the fact that many direc-

TABLE 13. STAFF MEDIAN SALARIES, BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

		MALE (N = 3978)				FEMALE (N = 1175)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT METRO/REGIONAL	18,350	17,020	18,930	7,450*	18,290	17,490	19,300	24,000*	18,510
STATE/FEDERAL	18,200	16,540	18,950	28,100*	18,530	14,500	18,600	17,050*	17,990
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	20,030	20,030	21,030	---	20,990	18,050	19,150	20,000*	19,040
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	17,980	14,030	17,050	24,000	18,260	12,050	18,000	23,980*	17,980
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT	23,770	22,980	24,280	24,850*	23,970	21,950	23,680	25,600*	22,990
METRO/REGIONAL STATE/FEDERAL	24,970	21,400	25,400	29,980	24,980	22,050	24,990	---	24,950
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	27,970	26,010	29,960	33,050	28,800	19,150	26,500	---	25,020
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	24,990	15,000	24,500	27,050	25,500	25,000*	22,100	24,050*	22,650
OVER 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT REGIONAL	29,990	29,970	30,050	33,450	30,020	24,030	30,000	---	28,950
STATE/FEDERAL	32,900	30,040	33,990	34,900	33,040	22,800	30,030	---	29,850
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	36,700	35,850	39,050	43,050	38,800	30,050	31,000	---	31,000
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	32,960	33,050	33,250	34,960	33,350	25,050*	22,000*	21,550	23,050

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES; SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

tors may work in single-person agencies and receive little salary advantage from their position.

The picture is less clear in business, consulting firms, universities, and foundations. Private consultants and planners working for businesses, with less than five years experience, earn essentially the same salaries as directors that they earn as staff. With five to 10 years of experience, however, the directors in these employment groups gain a salary advantage of about $2,000, and with 10 years of experience or more, the advantage increases to $3,000.

Heads of academic departments and foundations with 10 years or more of experience maintain a greater salary advantage over nondirectors than any other group. These heads of academic departments and foundations earn median salaries of $7,000 more than those of staff with comparable levels of experience.

REGIONAL EFFECTS

Tables 14 and 15 show the influence of geographic regions on salary levels. As Table 14 indicates, Canada and the Pacific region of the United States continue to be, overall, the highest paying regions in North America, as they have been in the past. Table 14 indicates that, for planners with five or more years of experience, the West South Central region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas) has moved to the third highest position in 1981—up from the third lowest in 1977. Although the region may not employ a high number of planners in proportion to its population (see page 4), it appears to pay its planners well. The East South Central region (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee) remains the lowest paying region as well as one of two with the lowest ratio of planners to population.

TABLE 14. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES--DIRECTORS AND STAFF: BY SEX, REGION, AND EXPERIENCE

	DIRECTORS (N=2675)			STAFF (N=5249)		
	MALE (2465)	FEMALE (210)	TOTAL	MALE (4053)	FEMALE (1196)	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS						
NEW ENGLAND	18,350	19,400*	18,700	17,010	17,030	17,000
MID-ATLANTIC	20,030	20,050*	20,030	17,980	17,010	17,310
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	20,010	20,050	20,010	18,050	18,000	17,990
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	21,000	18,050*	21,000	19,050	17,650	18,300
SOUTH ATLANTIC	19,200	18,200	18,450	18,680	17,530	17,970
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	18,750	10,000*	18,700	17,500	16,030	16,980
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	23,250	18,500*	21,500	18,900	19,010	18,920
MOUNTAIN	18,980	25,300*	18,980	19,900	18,320	19,150
PACIFIC	21,150	20,150	20,550	21,040	21,050	21,010
CANADA	38,600*	17,000*	17,050*	22,800	24,000*	22,850
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS						
NEW ENGLAND	24,970	20,000*	23,550	24,000	21,550	23,300
MID-ATLANTIC	24,970	22,500*	24,050	23,630	23,500	23,550
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	24,200	20,040	24,000	23,990	22,500	23,850
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	25,010	25,050*	25,020	23,550	23,850	23,550
SOUTH ATLANTIC	25,300	20,750	25,280	24,350	24,250	24,250
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	23,000	21,250	21,950	22,000	18,050	21,630
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	27,550	32,100*	27,800	26,020	24,480	25,300
MOUNTAIN	25,350	20,030	25,300	25,000	23,800	24,960
PACIFIC	29,990	32,000	30,000	28,010	25,030	27,450
CANADA	37,250	31,850*	37,250	31,980	30,050*	31,990
OVER 10 YEARS						
NEW ENGLAND	30,030	20,050*	30,010	29,980	19,500	28,050
MID-ATLANTIC	32,800	25,450*	32,020	31,970	27,030	30,980
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	34,300	23,650*	34,050	30,000	28,980	29,950
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	32,050	12,050*	32,030	34,050	25,600*	33,350
SOUTH ATLANTIC	35,960	34,030*	35,600	34,250	27,530	33,010
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	32,700	10,050*	32,030	28,800	23,450*	27,980
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	39,200	28,600*	38,200	34,500	34,550	34,050
MOUNTAIN	35,000	37,900*	35,010	33,960	27,050	32,980
PACIFIC	39,960	35,600	39,900	35,990	30,050	35,040
CANADA	45,010	50,000*	45,020	40,000	32,050*	39,500

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES: SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

TABLE 15. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX AND REGION

REGION	TOTAL	MALE (N=6589)	FEMALE (N=1432)
NEW ENGLAND	23,650	25,150	19,470
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	24,980	26,590	20,020
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	24,480	25,700	20,980
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	24,950	25,300	19,550
SOUTH ATLANTIC	26,030	27,980	20,250
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	23,400	25,010	17,550
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	25,600	27,630	20,960
MOUNTAIN	25,050	26,550	21,600
PACIFIC	29,520	30,970	24,010
CANADA	36,030	37,550	30,030

Within the United States, staff with five years or less of experience earn about $4,000 more in the highest paying region than they do in the lowest paying region. The most experienced staff planners earn $7,000 more in the highest paying region than their counterparts in the lowest paying region.

The overall median salaries by region shown in Table 15, although accurate, are again somewhat misleading. Note that Table 15 indicates that the South Atlantic region's overall median salary is higher than that of the West South Central region, despite the fact that at each level of experience the West South Central region's median salary is higher. We can account for this apparent discrepancy by hypothesizing that, overall, there are proportionately more experienced—and, therefore, more highly paid--planners in the South Atlantic region. Thus, while the rapidly growing West South Central region may have been hiring proportionately more planners in the past five years (see page 2) and paying them well, the planners they are hiring are at entry level. Table 14 will offer the individual planner more precise guidance on regional salary trends than Table 15.

TABLE 16. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS: BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

		WHITE	BLACK	HISP-WHT	AM IND	ASIAN	OTHER	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	6221	133	85	8	153	25	6625
	ROW PCT	93.9	2.0	1.3	0.1	2.3	0.4	81.8
	COL PCT	82.2	67.2	75.2	88.9	85.5	86.2	
	TOT PCT	76.8	1.6	1.0	0.1	1.9	0.3	
FEMALE	COUNT	1351	65	28	1	26	4	1475
	ROW PCT	91.6	4.4	1.9	0.1	1.8	0.3	18.2
	COL PCT	17.8	32.8	24.8	11.1	14.5	13.8	
	TOT PCT	16.7	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	
	COLUMN	7572	198	113	9	179	29	8100
	TOTAL	93.5	2.4	1.4	0.1	2.2	0.4	100.0

To read this and subsequent cross-tabulations, note the labels in the left-hand column of each table; for example, 6221 is the *number* of white males (count); 93.9 is the percent of all *male* planners who are white (row pct.); 82.2 is the percent of all *white* planners who are male (col. pct.); 76.8 is the percent of *all planners* who are white males (tot. pct.).

TABLE 17. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY RACE/ETHNICITY, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EMPLOYER

	NONMINORITY (N=7236)				MINORITY (N=492)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	18,720	17,510	19,130	---	18,670	18,030	19,350	21,450*	19,010
STATE/FEDERAL	18,400	16,480	18,920	25,000*	18,460	15,500	19,700	26,550*	19,000
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	20,030	19,250	20,530	---	20,030	24,000	22,000	20,050*	22,030
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	18,330	14,000	18,330	18,030*	19,000	14,900*	18,050	24,030	18,020
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT / METRO/REGIONAL	24,030	22,990	24,980	---	24,040	22,250	24,000	30,050	24,000
STATE/FEDERAL	25,000	22,000	25,050	26,590*	24,990	22,000	27,000	30,030	26,000
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	28,750	25,970	29,950	30,000*	28,250	30,000*	30,000	32,980	30,010*
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	25,030	20,050	24,000	24,050*	25,040	15,000*	30,450	27,550	30,000
OVER 10 YEARS									
CITY/COUNTY/JOINT/ METRO/REGIONAL	31,100	30,010	31,980	---	31,020	35,750	33,000	38,950*	34,050
STATE/FEDERAL	33,970	31,000	34,300	25,050*	33,960	32,000*	37,180	40,000	34,020
PRIVATE CONSULTANT/ BUSINESS	39,960	38,990	39,960	30,000*	39,970	38,050	39,550	45,000	38,050
UNIVERSITY/FOUNDATION	35,040	35,000	34,980	45,000	35,030	19,200*	35,980	37,020	36,000

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES: SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION AND SALARIES

Minority representation in planning has increased in recent years: in 1977, 5.3 percent of the respondents reported themselves to be minority group members; in 1980, 5.6 percent; and in 1981, 6.5 percent, a 22.6 percent rate of gain since 1977. Minority representation in 1981 is higher among women planners (8.5 percent) than among men (6.1 percent), with most of the difference accounted for by the presence of a relatively high proportion of black women planners. The proportion of black planners represented among women (4.4 percent) is more than twice that of men (two percent).

The overall representation of black planners in the profession has not increased in a decade, however. In 1971, black planners represented 2.2 percent of the respondents to the annual survey. Although in 1974 the proportion of black planners had increased to 3.3 percent, by 1977 the percentage had declined to 2.4 percent, where it remains today. Table 16 indicates the distribution of planners who identify themselves as belonging to minority groups.

Table 17 indicates median salaries by race/ethnicity, educational qualifications, years of experience, and employer. Minority and nonminority planners earn approximately the same salaries, with minority planners indicating a slight advantage in most categories. In two categories, however, minority planners earn significantly higher salaries. Planners working for universities and foundations, with five to 10 years of experience, earn a median salary almost $5,000 more than nonminority planners, and local government planners with over 10 years of experience earn $3,000 more.

TABLE 18. COMPARISON OF JURISDICTIONS: BY SIZE AND TYPE

JURISDICTIONS	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
SIZE	
250,000 AND OVER	33.6
50,000 TO 249,999	38.6
UNDER 50,000	27.7
TYPE (SELF-DEFINED)	
URBAN	59
SUBURBAN	24.7
RURAL	15.9

SUBURBAN SALARIES HIGHEST

This year's survey included a new question asking planners in local public agencies to describe their jurisdictions as urban, suburban, or rural. (No definition of these terms was provided by APA.) The data, when combined with data on size of jurisdiction, presents a fuller picture of the types of communities in which planners work, for purposes of comparing salaries.

Table 18 shows that respondents to this question are relatively equally distributed in large, medium, and small jurisdictions. However, the distribution is much less uniform when planners designate their jurisdictions by their own definitions as urban, suburban, or rural. Almost 59 percent of the respondents called their jurisdictions urban. More than 400 jurisdictions with fewer than 50,000 people were designated urban by respondents. On the other hand, there were 71 respondents in jurisdictions with more than 250,000 people—presumably populous non-metropolitan counties—who called these jurisdictions rural. (See Table 19.)

Table 19 presents salary data for jurisdictions according to the self-defined categories—urban, suburban, and rural. The jurisdictions identified as suburban paid their planners the highest salaries, with one exception. (Urban jurisdictions of over 250,000 pay slightly more.) Planners who identified their jurisdictions as rural earned consistently less than their urban and suburban counterparts, regardless of the actual population of the jurisdiction. Median salaries range from approximately 10 to 20 percent less in rural communities than in suburban communities, depending on population size. Indeed, even the highest paid rural planner's median salary is lower than the *lowest* paid suburban or urban planner's median salary.

TABLE 19. PUBLIC AGENCY PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY JURISDICTION TYPE

JURISDICTION			
TYPE	SIZE	NUMBER	MEDIAN SALARY
URBAN	250,000 OR MORE	1106	26,980
	50,000 TO 249,999	856	24,820
	UNDER 50,000	462	24,010
SUBURBAN	250,000 OR MORE	199	26,500
	50,000 TO 249,999	397	26,230
	UNDER 50,000	416	24,960
RURAL	250,000 OR MORE	71	24,000
	50,000 TO 249,999	322	21,130
	UNDER 50,000	257	20,450

THE EFFECT OF POPULATION GROWTH RATE ON SALARIES

Population growth rates are not immediately reflected in median salaries, although population growth rates do appear to affect the number of planners employed. (See Table 5, page 4, and Table 20.) Although stable/declining areas report the lowest median salaries at all levels of experience, the salary differentials are not great, especially at entry level. With the exception of male planners with a Ph.D., in declining areas (with a high median salary), planners with more than five years of experience earn the highest salaries in stable/growing areas, rather than in high growth areas. This salary advantage increases with 10 years or more of experience. This apparent disparity may reflect higher initial salaries in the past for planners from states once categorized as high growth, which have now leveled off to the growing/stable category—e.g., California. (See Appendix A for state growth rates.)

It is important to note when comparing salaries by region (pages 10 and 12, and Table 14) and salaries by growth rate of areas (Table 20) that, while the highest paying regions all include states with high population growth rates, individual states with high growth rates may be found in relatively low-paying regions as well.

TABLE 20. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES, BY SEX, QUALIFICATION, EXPERIENCE, AND GROWTH AREA

	MALE (N = 6375)					FEMALE (N = 1387)			
	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL	BA	MA	PHD/LAW	TOTAL
UNDER 5 YEARS									
HIGH GROWTH AREA	19,030	19,050	19,500	24,030*	19,510	17,970	18,960	20,030*	18,500
STABLE GROWTH AREA	19,010	18,000	19,970	26,500	19,190	18,400	19,250	24,000*	19,030
LOW/LOSS GROWTH AREA	18,040	16,460	19,040	24,000	18,580	14,800	18,990	21,500*	17,990
BETWEEN 5 AND 10 YEARS									
HIGH GROWTH AREA	25,100	24,300	26,010	27,550	25,280	20,100	25,050	31,050*	24,600
STABLE GROWTH AREA	25,530	24,030	27,000	30,040	26,250	22,030	24,530	20,030	23,750
LOW/LOSS GROWTH AREA	24,040	22,400	24,980	27,050	24,230	20,150	24,650	27,000*	24,040
OVER 10 YEARS									
HIGH GROWTH AREA	33,960	33,050	34,970	35,550	34,050	27,050	28,650	41,000*	28,550
STABLE GROWTH AREA	35,010	34,960	35,960	38,030	35,580	27,530	31,950	35,000*	30,040
LOW/LOSS GROWTH AREA	32,400	30,040	34,010	40,030	33,000	24,000	29,980	19,050*	27,030

*LESS THAN 10 RESPONSES; SAMPLE SIZE NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

Section 3. Women Planners: Salaries and Employment Patterns

Women have steadily increased their proportion of membership in APA in the last five years. The percentage of women planners has risen from 10.4 percent in 1977, to 14 percent in 1980, to 18.2 percent in 1981. While women are relatively better represented in the profession, they have not done as well in terms of salaries or promotions to positions as directors of agencies, firms, or planning departments. (See Tables 21 and 22.)

Not only is there a discrepancy between median salaries for men and women, but the discrepancy has widened over the last five years. While salaries of women planners were 80 percent of the salaries of men planners in 1977, women's salaries by 1981 were down to 76 percent of men's salaries. The salary tables in the previous section provide details of men's and women's salaries for a number of variables.

WOMEN DIRECTORS AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Women are poorly represented as directors, in proportion to their numbers. Slightly more than 92 percent of all planning directors and heads of firms and academic departments are men; eight percent, women. While 39 percent of all male planners are directors, only 15 percent of all female planners are directors. Of the total number of members responding, 35 percent reported that they were directors—32.2 percent men and only 2.8 percent women. (See Table 22.)

Part of the explanation for this extreme discrepancy may be found in the fact that women have significantly fewer years of experience in the planning field. The median number of years of experience for all men is 8.9; for women, 4.4—less than half. Male planners thus have an important advantage in terms of eligibility for promotion as well as in overall salary. (See Table 23.)

Tables 12 and 13 in the previous section provide details for directors' and nondirectors' salaries, by sex. Comparisons of directors' salaries by sex is difficult because of the small number of responses for women in many categories. For nondepartment heads, where there is sufficient data, state and federal salaries for men and women planners with five to 10 years of experience is the only employment category in which parity between men's and women's salaries appears to have been achieved. It is certainly the case that the large number of directors among male planners helps to raise their overall median salary levels above that of women. Nevertheless, the median salary level of only those men and women who are *not* directors display similar inequities. The median salary in 1981 for men who were not directors was about $25,000; for women who were not directors, about $21,000.

TABLE 21. PLANNERS' MEDIAN SALARIES: BY SEX

	MEDIAN SALARIES		
YEAR	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
1977	19,500	20,000	16,000
1980	24,000	24,800	19,300
1981	25,990	27,630	21,050

TABLE 22. DISTRIBUTION OF DIRECTORS : BY SEX

		AGENCY DIRECTOR			ROW TOTAL
		YES	NO	N. A.	
MALE	COUNT	2508	3467	404	6379
	ROW PCT	39.3	54.4	6.3	81.9
	COL PCT	92.1	76.8	74.3	
	TOT PCT	32.2	44.5	5.2	
FEMALE	COUNT	216	1050	140	1406
	ROW PCT	15.4	74.7	10.0	18.1
	COL PCT	7.9	23.2	25.7	
	TOT PCT	2.8	13.5	1.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	2724	4517	544	7785
		35.0	58.0	7.0	100.0

TABLE 23. YEARS OF PLANNERS' EXPERIENCE: BY SEX

		LESSYEAR	1 YR	2 YRS	3 YRS	4 YRS	5 YRS	6 YRS
MALE	COUNT	34	231	349	383	447	462	430
	ROW PCT	0.5	3.5	5.2	5.7	6.7	6.9	6.5
	COL PCT	59.6	55.8	64.9	67.9	72.2	76.4	78.2
	TOT PCT	0.4	2.8	4.3	4.7	5.5	5.7	5.3
FEMALE	COUNT	23	183	189	181	172	143	120
	ROW PCT	1.6	12.4	12.8	12.3	11.7	9.7	8.2
	COL PCT	40.4	44.2	35.1	32.1	27.8	23.6	21.8
	TOT PCT	0.3	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.8	1.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	57	414	538	564	619	605	550
		0.7	5.1	6.6	6.9	7.6	7.4	6.8

		7 YRS	8 YRS	9 YRS	10-14	15-19	20 PLUS	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	387	482	292	1381	671	1113	6662
	ROW PCT	5.8	7.2	4.4	20.7	10.1	16.7	81.9
	COL PCT	81.6	86.5	85.4	89.5	95.3	95.4	
	TOT PCT	4.8	5.9	3.6	17.0	8.2	13.7	
FEMALE	COUNT	87	75	50	162	33	54	1472
	ROW PCT	5.9	5.1	3.4	11.0	2.2	3.7	18.1
	COL PCT	18.4	13.5	14.6	10.5	4.7	4.6	
	TOT PCT	1.1	0.9	0.6	2.0	0.4	0.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	474	557	342	1543	704	1167	8134
		5.8	6.8	4.2	19.0	8.7	14.3	100.0

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

The educational levels of the two groups offer no rationale for observed salary differences. Men and women planners are equally qualified academically, up to the level of Ph.D. A slightly greater percentage of women planners (68.5 percent) than men (63.3 percent) have master's degrees. Ph.D. degrees, however (representing 6.1 percent of the total), are held by men by a ratio of more than two to one. (See Table 24.)

TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

The types of employment of women planners reflect that of men fairly closely, with one exception: the percentage of women planners working in the nonprofit sector (5.7 percent) is more than double that of men (2.7). Federal and state governments attract proportionately more women than men, but men are more likely to be represented in college and university positions. The proportion of women working in colleges and universities is about three-quarters that of men. The higher proportion of men with Ph.D.'s may explain the difference.

Table 25 provides details on types of employment cross-tabulated by sex.

SIZE OF JURISDICTION

A higher proportion of women than men work in the largest jurisdictions. More than 40 percent of women planners work in jurisdictions with populations of 250,000 or more, compared to 32.6 percent of men planners. At the other end of the scale, fewer women (26.5 percent) than men (31.4 percent) work in jurisdictions with populations of under 50,000. (See Table 26.)

The choice of larger jurisdictions for employment by women may be influenced by the fact that women plan-

TABLE 24. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS: BY SEX AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

		DEGREE			
		B.A.	M.A.	PHD.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	1966	4175	451	6592
	ROW PCT	29.8	63.3	6.8	81.8
	COL PCT	82.4	80.6	91.1	
	TOT PCT	24.4	51.8	5.6	
FEMALE	COUNT	419	1006	44	1469
	ROW PCT	28.5	68.5	3.0	18.2
	COL PCT	17.6	19.4	8.9	
	TOT PCT	5.2	12.5	0.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	2385	5181	95	8061
		29.6	64.3	[illegible]	100.0

TABLE 25. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNING EMPLOYMENT: BY SEX

		CITY	COUNTY	JTCTCY	METRO	STATE	OTHER
MALE	COUNT	1765	782	178	572	171	541
	ROW PCT	27.4	12.1	2.8	8.9	2.6	8.4
	COL PCT	82.1	83.8	84.0	82.7	84.7	78.3
	TOT PCT	22.4	9.9	2.3	7.3	2.2	6.9
FEMALE	COUNT	384	151	34	120	31	150
	ROW PCT	27.3	10.7	2.4	8.5	2.2	10.6
	COL PCT	17.9	16.2	16.0	17.3	15.3	21.7
	TOT PCT	4.9	1.9	0.4	1.5	0.4	1.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	2149	933	212	692	202	691
	COLUMN TOTAL	27.3	11.9	2.7	8.8	2.6	8.8

		FEDERAL	PRIVATE	BUSINESS	COLLEGE	NONPROFT	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	254	1271	313	429	177	6453
	ROW PCT	3.9	19.7	4.9	6.6	2.7	82.1
	COL PCT	77.7	83.5	83.0	86.0	68.9	
	TOT PCT	3.2	16.2	4.0	5.5	2.3	
FEMALE	COUNT	73	252	64	70	80	1409
	ROW PCT	5.2	17.9	4.5	5.0	5.7	17.9
	COL PCT	22.3	16.5	17.0	14.0	31.1	
	TOT PCT	0.9	3.2	0.8	0.9	1.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	327	1523	377	499	257	7862
	COLUMN TOTAL	4.2	19.4	4.8	6.3	3.3	100.0

ners working in jurisdictions of over 250,000 earn higher salaries than women in smaller jurisdictions at all levels of experience. (See Table 11 and page 9.) Although the salary advantage offered by large jurisidictions holds true for men as well as women, the effect is more pronounced for women's salaries.

Women with five to 10 years of experience, for example, earn more than $3,800 more in the largest jurisdictions than they do in the smallest ones; the differential between salaries in large and small jurisdictions for men is $620. For women with over 10 years of experience, the salary advantage offered by larger jurisdictions remains; the difference between salaries in large and small areas for women planners is $8,350; for men, the difference is $5,450.

With increasing years of experience, differences in salaries for men and women appear throughout that compound the salary differences between large and small jurisdictions. With less than five years of experience, men and women planners earn approximately the same salaries in jurisdictions of all sizes. At more advanced levels of planning experience, however, not only do smaller jurisdictions offer women lower salaries than larger jurisdictions, but men's median salaries begin increasingly to outpace women's salaries. For example, with five to 10 years of experience, men and women planners in jurisdictions with populations of over 250,000 earn equivalent salaries; with 10 years of experience in the same size jurisdictions (250,000 population), men have a $2,680 edge. Again, with five to 10 years of experience in cities from 50,000 to 250,000, men have a salary edge of $2,330; with over 10 years of experience in cities of the same middle-sized range, men's salary advantage has increased to $3,480.

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Table 14 in the previous section indicates the effect of regional distribution on salaries by sex. Although there

TABLE 26. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS' EMPLOYMENT: BY SEX AND JURISDICTION SIZE

		MILL PLUS	500-999K	250-499K	100-249K	50-99K	25-49K	10-24K	LESS 10K	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	423	404	441	724	677	592	421	209	3891
	ROW PCT	10.9	10.4	11.3	18.6	17.4	15.2	10.8	5.4	81.8
	COL PCT	74.1	80.6	80.6	82.8	83.3	86.2	82.7	82.0	
	TOT PCT	8.9	8.5	9.3	15.2	14.2	12.4	8.9	4.4	
FEMALE	COUNT	148	97	106	150	136	95	88	46	866
	ROW PCT	17.1	11.2	12.2	17.3	15.7	11.0	10.2	5.3	18.2
	COL PCT	25.9	19.4	19.4	17.2	16.7	13.8	17.3	18.0	
	TOT PCT	3.1	2.0	2.2	3.2	2.9	2.0	1.8	1.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	571	501	547	874	813	687	509	255	4757
	COLUMN TOTAL	12.0	10.5	11.5	18.4	17.1	14.4	10.7	5.4	100.0

TABLE 27. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS: BY SEX AND REGION

REGION	PERCENT OF ALL MALES	PERCENT OF ALL FEMALES
NEW ENGLAND	6	6.9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	12.2	13.7
SOUTH ATLANTIC	19.8	20.0
EAST NORTH CENTRAL	14.4	12.6
WEST NORTH CENTRAL	7.3	4.8
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL	3.9	3.4
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL	6.3	7.4
MOUNTAIN	7.7	7.3
PACIFIC	19.6	21.8
CANADA	1.7	.2

is no one region that consistently offers salaries to women equal to those it offers men—at all levels of experience, for directors and for staff—two regions offer nearly equal salaries in two of the six categories examined. The West South Central region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas), offers comparable salaries to men and women staff with fewer than five years of experience and men and women staff with more than 10 years of experience. The Pacific region's salaries are comparable for men and women staff with less than five years of experience and advantageous for women directors with five to 10 years of experience.

The distribution of men and women by region is fairly consistent between men and women. (See Table 27.) Only in the West North Central region is there a discrepancy. In that region, the percentage of men planners is almost a third greater than the percentage of women planners. The state-by-state data indicate that only one woman planner from North Dakota, and none from South Dakota, responded from this region. (See Table 28, which provides a look at the distribution of planners by state.)

TABLE 28. DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNERS: BY SEX AND STATE

		CANADA	OTHER	ME	VT	NH	MA	CT	RI
MALE	COUNT	142	38	31	17	32	171	108	35
	ROW PCT	2.1	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.5	2.6	1.6	0.5
	COL PCT	88.2	76.0	86.1	70.8	80.0	76.7	84.4	77.8
	TOT PCT	1.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	2.1	1.3	0.4
FEMALE	COUNT	19	12	5	7	8	52	20	10
	ROW PCT	1.3	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.5	3.5	1.4	0.7
	COL PCT	11.8	24.0	13.9	29.2	20.0	23.3	15.6	22.2
	TOT PCT	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	161	50	36	24	40	223	128	45
		2.0	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	2.7	1.6	0.6

		NY	NJ	PA	WI	IL	IN	MI	OH
MALE	COUNT	390	165	258	155	301	69	248	192
	ROW PCT	5.8	2.5	3.9	2.3	4.5	1.0	3.7	2.9
	COL PCT	79.3	81.3	80.6	87.1	80.7	76.7	87.0	85.3
	TOT PCT	4.8	2.0	3.2	1.9	3.7	0.8	3.0	2.4
FEMALE	COUNT	102	38	62	23	72	21	37	33
	ROW PCT	6.9	2.6	4.2	1.6	4.9	1.4	2.5	2.2
	COL PCT	20.7	18.7	19.4	12.9	19.3	23.3	13.0	14.7
	TOT PCT	1.2	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.5	0.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	492	203	320	178	373	90	285	225
		6.0	2.5	3.9	2.2	4.6	1.1	3.5	2.8

		MN	IA	MO	ND	SD	NE	KS	WI
MALE	COUNT	189	74	99	19	10	39	58	17
	ROW PCT	2.3	1.1	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.9	0.3
	COL PCT	85.1	91.4	83.9	95.0	100.0	86.7	93.5	85.0
	TOT PCT	2.3	0.9	1.2	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.2
FEMALE	COUNT	33	7	19	1	0	[illegible]	4	3
	ROW PCT	2.2	0.5	1.3	0.1	0.0	[illegible]	0.3	0.2
	COL PCT	14.9	8.6	16.1	5.0	0.0	[illegible]	6.5	15.0
	TOT PCT	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
	COLUMN TOTAL	222	81	118	20	10	45	62	20
		2.7	1.0	1.4	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.2

(CONTINUED)

TABLE 28. CONTINUED

		MD	WV	VA	DC	NC	SC	GA	FL
MALE	COUNT	158	29	252	161	169	79	132	324
	ROW PCT	2.4	0.4	3.8	2.4	2.5	1.2	2.0	4.8
	COL PCT	79.4	93.5	83.7	76.7	84.1	84.0	79.0	82.4
	TOT PCT	1.9	0.4	3.1	2.0	2.1	1.0	1.6	4.0
FEMALE	COUNT	41	2	49	49	32	15	35	69
	ROW PCT	2.8	0.1	3.3	3.3	2.2	1.0	2.4	4.7
	COL PCT	20.6	6.5	16.3	23.3	15.9	16.0	21.0	17.6
	TOT PCT	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.8
	COLUMN TOTAL	199 2.4	31 0.4	301 3.7	210 2.6	201 2.5	94 1.2	167 2.0	393 4.8

		KY	TN	AL	MS	AR	OK	LA	TX
MALE	COUNT	67	108	61	28	32	92	74	262
	ROW PCT	1.0	1.6	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.1	3.9
	COL PCT	81.7	84.4	84.7	84.8	94.1	77.6	81.3	77.3
	TOT PCT	0.8	1.3	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.9	3.2
FEMALE	COUNT	15	20	11	5	2	15	17	77
	ROW PCT	1.0	1.4	0.7	0.3	0.1	1.0	1.1	5.2
	COL PCT	18.3	15.6	15.3	15.2	5.9	22.4	18.7	22.7
	TOT PCT	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.9
	COLUMN TOTAL	82 1.0	128 1.6	72 0.9	33 0.4	34 0.4	67 0.8	91 1.1	339 4.2

		MT	ID	WY	NV	UT	CO	AZ	NM
MALE	COUNT	20	23	22	45	60	207	106	34
	ROW PCT	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.9	3.1	1.6	0.5
	COL PCT	83.3	88.5	73.3	81.8	88.2	81.2	86.9	73.9
	TOT PCT	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.7	2.5	1.3	0.4
FEMALE	COUNT	4	3	8	10	8	48	16	12
	ROW PCT	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.5	3.2	1.1	0.8
	COL PCT	16.7	11.5	26.7	18.2	11.8	18.8	13.1	26.1
	TOT PCT	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.1
	COLUMN TOTAL	24 0.3	26 0.3	30 0.4	55 0.7	68 0.8	255 3.1	122 1.5	46 0.6

		WA	OR	CA	AK	HI	ROW TOTAL
MALE	COUNT	170	135	930	40	41	6682
	ROW PCT	2.5	2.0	13.9	0.6	0.6	81.9
	COL PCT	82.9	83.3	79.6	75.5	82.0	
	TOT PCT	2.1	1.7	11.4	0.5	0.5	
FEMALE	COUNT	35	27	239	13	9	1480
	ROW PCT	2.4	1.8	16.1	0.9	0.6	18.1
	COL PCT	17.1	16.7	20.4	24.5	18.0	
	TOT PCT	0.4	0.3	2.9	0.2	0.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	205 2.5	162 2.0	1169 14.3	53 0.6	50 0.6	8162 100.0

IN CONCLUSION

Wage differentials between men and women are somewhat smaller for planners with fewer years of experience. It is at higher levels that major disparities occur. Only time will tell if the more equitable salary policies now in place for entry level positions will follow new planners through their careers. Since over half of women planners are still in the beginning level of the profession, this is an issue of vital concern.

Appendix A. Growth Factor Among States

		Growth Rate	Population
1.	Nevada	63.5 %	799,184
2.	Arizona	53.1	2,717,886
3.	Florida	43.4	9,739,992
4.	Wyoming	41.6	470,816
5.	Utah	37.9	1,461,037
6.	Alaska	32.4	400,481
7.	Idaho	32.4	943,935
8.	Colorado	30.7	2,888,834
9.	New Mexico	27.8	1,299,968
10.	Texas	27.1	14,228,383
11.	Oregon	25.9	2,632,663
12.	Hawaii	25.3	965,000
13.	New Hampshire	24.8	920,610
14.	Washington	21.0	4,130,163
15.	So. Carolina	20.4	3,119,208
16.	Georgia	19.1	5,464,265
17.	Arkansas	18.8	2,265,513
18.	California	18.5	23,668,562
19.	Oklahoma	18.2	3,025,266
20.	Tennessee	16.9	4,509,750
21.	No. Carolina	15.5	5,874,429
22.	Louisiana	15.3	4,203,972
23.	Vermont	15.0	511,456
24.	Virginia	14.9	5,346,279
25.	Kentucky	13.7	3,661,433
26.	Mississippi	13.7	2,520,638
27.	Montana	13.3	786,690
28.	Maine	13.2	1,124,660
29.	Alabama	12.9	3,890,061
30.	West Virginia	11.8	1,949,644
31.	Delaware	8.6	595,225
32	Maryland	7.5	4,216,446
33.	Minnesota	7.1	4,077,148
34.	Wisconsin	6.5	4,705,335
35.	Indiana	5.7	5,490,179
36.	Nebraska	5.7	1,570,006
37.	North Dakota	5.6	652,695
38.	Kansas	5.1	2,363,208
39.	Missouri	5.1	4,917,444
40.	Michigan	4.2	9,258,344
41.	South Dakota	3.6	690,178
42.	Iowa	3.1	2,913,387
43.	Illinois	2.8	11,418,461
44.	New Jersey	2.7	7,364,158
45.	Connecticut	2.5	3,107,576
46.	Ohio	1.3	10,797,419
47.	Massachusetts	.8	5,737,037
48.	Pennsylvania	.6	11,866,728
49.	Rhode Island	- .3	947,154
50.	New York	- 3.8	17,557,288
51.	D.C.	-15.7	637,651
	U.S. Total	11.4%	226,504,825

Source: Based on the 1980 census count and the U.S. Bureau of the Census Series II-B Projection, March 1979.

RECENT PLANNING ADVISORY SERVICE REPORTS

321 **Writing Better Zoning Reports.** October 1976. 8 pp. $5; PAS subscribers $3.

322 **The Language of Zoning: A Glossary of Words and Phrases.** November 1976. 40 pp. $7; PAS subscribers $5.

323 **Audiovisual Materials on Planning: An Annotated Listing from "Aesthetics" to "Zoning."** December 1976. 25 pp. $5; PAS subscribers $3.

324 **Mini-Warehouses.** February 1977. 22 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

325 **Zoning and Subdivision Fees: Current Practice.** March 1977. 13 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

326 **Zoning for Recreational Vehicle Parks.** April 1977. 26 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

327 **Regulating Sex Businesses.** May 1977. 30 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

328 **Caring for the Land: Environmental Principles for Site Design and Review.** July 1977. 94 pp. $9; PAS subscribers $7.

329 **Salaries and Tenure of Professional Planners: 1977.** September 1977. 17 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

330 **Housing Planning: How to Meet HUD's 701 Requirements.** November 1977. 26 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

331 **Planning for Wildlife in Cities and Suburbs.** January 1978. 64 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

332 **Street-Naming and Property-Numbering Systems.** March 1978. 46 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

333 **Saving Farms and Farmlands: A Community Guide.** July 1978. 46 pp. $6; PAS subscribers $5.

334 **Expenditures, Staff, and Salaries of Planning Agencies, 1978.** July 1978. 64 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

335 **Parking Lot Landscaping.** August 1978. 31 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

336 **Evaluating Alternative Plans.** October 1978. 31 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

337 **Homeowners' Associations: Problems and Remedies.** October 1978. 22 pp. $8; PAS subscribers $5.

338 **The Carrying Capacity Concept as a Planning Tool.** December 1978. 26 pp. $7; PAS subscribers $5.

339 **Computer-Assisted Land Resources Planning.** January 1979. 46 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

340 **The Planner's Role in Facilitating Private Sector Reinvestment.** March 1979. 30 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

341 **Energy-Efficient Land Use.** May 1979. 25 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

342 **A Guide to Neighborhood Planning.** July 1979. 46 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

343 **Condominium Conversion Regulations: Protecting Tenants.** September 1979. 22 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

344 **Designing and Conducting Workshops: A Practical Guide.** October 1979. 16 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

345 **Salaries and Tenure of Professional Planners: 1979.** October 1979. 14 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

346 **Making the Most of Federal Assistance: Little-Known Programs for Planners.** November 1979. 16 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

*347 **Sand and Gravel Resources: Protection, Regulation, and Reclamation.** January 1980. 33 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

*348 **The Planning Commission: Its Composition and Function, 1979.** March 1980. 13 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

349 **Energy in the Cities Symposium.** April 1980. 44 pp. $6.

350 **Low- and Moderate-Income Housing: Part I. Increasing the Supply and Accessibility.** May 1980. 26 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

351 **Low- and Moderate-Income Housing: Part II. Conserving What We Have.** June 1980. 22 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

352 **Energy-conserving Development Regulations: Current Practice.** August 1980. 58 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

353 **Local Economic Development Planning: From Goals to Projects.** September 1980. 34 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

*354 **The Mechanics of Sign Control.** October 1980. 26 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

*355 **Salaries and Tenure of Professional Planners.** November 1980. 18 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

*356 **The Cluster Subdivision: A Cost-Effective Approach.** December 1980. 29 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

*357 **Setting Zoning and Subdivision Fees: Making Ends Meet.** January 1981. 22 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

358 **Analyzing Neighborhood Retail Opportunities: A Guide for Carrying Out a Preliminary Market Study.** February 1981. 22 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

*359 **Reducing Landslide Hazards: A Guide for Planners.** March 1981. 29 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

360 **Regulating Mobile Homes.** April 1981. 28 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

*361 **Oblique Aerial Photography for Urban Planning.** May 1981. 26 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

362 **Loft Conversions: Planning Issues, Problems, and Prospects.** August 1981. 38 pp. $12; PAS subscribers $6.

*363 **Linking Plans and Regulations: Local Responses to Consistency Laws in California and Florida.** September 1981. 26 pp. PAS subscribers $5.

364 **Reducing Earthquake Risks: A Planner's Guide.** October 1981. 82 pp. $18; PAS subscribers $10.

365 **Accessory Apartments: Using Surplus Space in Single-Family Houses.** December 1981. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

366 **Planners' Salaries and Employment Trends, 1981.** January 1982. 22 pp. $10; PAS subscribers $5.

*Available only to subscribers of Planning Advisory Service.